# STATE OF ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:	)		
JULIE A. QUALLS,	)		
Complainant, and RENT-A-CAR, INC.,	) ) ) ) )	CHARGE NO(S): EEOC NO(S): ALS NO(S):	21BA70466
Respondent.	)		
	NOTIC	<u>E</u>	
You are hereby notified that the Illino exceptions to the Recommended Order and oursuant to Section 8A-103(A) and/or 8B-25300.910 of the Commission's Procedural Recome the Order and Decision of the Commission of the Commission of the Commission.	d Decis 103(A) o ules, tha	ion in the above named of the Illinois Human Rig	case. Accordingly,
STATE OF ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION	)	Entered this 9 <sup>th</sup> day	of February 2010
		N. KEITH CHAMBERS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	

## STATE OF ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:	)
JULIE A. QUALLS,	)
Complainant,	)
and	) Charge No.: 2007CF1468
RENT-A-CAR, INC.,	) EEOC No.: 21BA70466 ) ALS No.: 08-0281
Respondent.	) Judge Gertrude L. McCarthy

### RECOMMENDED ORDER AND DECISION

On June 17, 2008, the Illinois Department of Human Rights (Department) filed a Complaint of Civil Rights Violation on behalf of Complainant. The complaint alleged discrimination based on race and gender in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act (Act).

On January 30, 2009, Respondent filed its *Motion to Dismiss for Want of Prosecution*.

The Department is an additional statutory agency that has issued state actions in this matter. The Department is therefore named as an additional party of record.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The following facts were derived from the record file in this matter:

- 1. On June 17, 2008, the Department filed a *Complaint of Civil Rights Violation* on behalf of Complainant alleging discrimination based on race and gender in violation of the Act.
- 2. On June 25, 2008, the Commission sent a *Notice of Public Hearing* to Complainant at the address. of record, 1931 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Maywood, II., 60153. That notice scheduled a hearing for September 10, 2008.

- The Commission received proof of receipt by Complainant of the June 25,
   2008 mailing.
- 4. On July 25, 2008, Respondent's filed its *Motion to Dismiss Or, in the*Alternative, to Stay Proceedings and Compel Arbitration with an accompanying memorandum and affidavits. That matter was set for August 13, 2008.
- Complainant failed to appear for scheduled dates of August 13, 2008,
   October 30, 2008, December 10, 2008 and March 11, 2009.
- 6. On January 30, 2009 Respondent filed its *Motion to Dismiss for Want of Prosecution*.
  - 7. Complainant did not respond to the pending motion.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. Complainant's failure to prosecute her case has unreasonably delayed the proceedings in this matter.
- 2. As a result of Complainant's failure to prosecute her case, this matter should be dismissed.

#### DISCUSSION

On June 17, 2008, the Department filed a *Complaint of Civil Rights Violation* alleging discrimination based on race and gender in violation of the Act.

Complainant failed to appear for status dates of August 13, 2008, October 30, 2008, December 10, 2008 and March 11, 2009.

On July 15, 2008, Respondent filed its *Motion to Dismiss, Or in the Alternative, to Stay Proceedings and Compel Arbitration.* 

On January 30, 2009, Respondent filed it's a Motion to Dismiss for Want or Prosecution.

Respondent filed *Certificates of Service* with the Commission. One certificate showed notice to Complainant, through certified service, of the order of August 13, 2008.

Other Certificates of Service indicated that the orders of October 30, 2008 and

December 10,2 008 were sent to Complaint via regular mail.

The Complainant has not filed a response to the penaing motion.

Complainant has done nothing to ensure that her complaint is heard.

Complainant's actions, therefore have unreasonably delayed the proceedings in

this matter.

It is a fundamental principle governing practice before the Commission that it is

the singular responsibility of complainants to diligently pursue the disposition of their

cases once they are docketed with the Commission. See Johnson and Valley Green

Management Co., IHRC, 11469, July 25, 2002.

The Commission routinely dismisses abandoned claims. See e.g. Leonard and

Solid Matter, Inc., IHRC, 4942, August 25, 1992. Additionally, the Commission has

dismissed cases where Complainant has failed to appear before the Commission on

dates scheduled for hearing or status. See, e.g. Stewart and SBC Midwest, IHRC, 04-

227, March 22, 2006, and Jackson and Chicago Firefighters Union Local No. 2, IHRC,

8193, September 29, 1997. In light of those precedents, this case should be dismissed.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that the complaint in this matter be

dismissed in its entirety, with prejudice.

**HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION** 

ΒY	·
	GERTRUDE L. MCCARTHY

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SECTION

ENTERED: <u>March 16, 2009</u>

3